arXiv:1701.06372v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 23 Jan 2017

Thermospin effects in superconducting heterostructures

I. V. Bobkova[1,2] and A. M. Bobkov[1]

[1] *Institute of Solid State Physics, Chernogolovka, Moscow reg., 142432 Russia*
[2] *Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Dolgoprudny, 141700 Russia*

(Dated: January 24, 2017)

Recently the thermally created pure spin currents were predicted for Zeeman-split superconductor/normal metal heterostructures. Here it is shown that this "thermospin" current can lead to an accumulation of a pure spin imbalance in a system. The thermally induced spin imbalance can reach the value of Zeeman splitting of the superconducting DOS and strongly influences superconductivity in the heterostructure. Depending on the temperature difference between the superconductor and the normal reservoir it can enhance the critical temperature of the superconductor or additionally suppress the zero-temperature superconducting state. The last possibility gives rise to an unusual superconducting state, which starts to develop at finite temperature.

The coupling of superconductivity and magnetism in hybrid structures is in focus of the research in condensed matter physics now. It leads to many interesting fundamental effects. Among them are Cooper pairs with finite center of mass momentum, triplet odd frequency Cooper pairs[1–13], longer spin lifetimes and spin charge separation[14–25], fully spin-polarized electric currents[26]. The most part of the mentioned effects is based on coupling charge and spin degrees of freedom and, therefore, is of interest of superconducting spintronics[27].

Recently it has been also shown that coupling of heat transport and charge degrees of freedom in superconductor/ferromagnet (S/F) hybrid structures also results in quite interesting effects. The so-called giant thermoelectric effect was predicted in S/F heterostructures with applied in-plane magnetic field[28,29] and in superconductors with magnetic impurities[30]. The theoretical prediction of the giant thermoelectric effect in S/F heterostructures was experimentally realized in Refs. 31 and 32. It was also predicted that use of doubly Zeeman-split superconducting bilayers enhances the thermoelectric effect significantly[33]. Further the thermoelectric effect was proposed in superconducting hybrids with spin-textured materials without need to apply an external magnetic field[34].

It was reported that in addition to thermally created electric currents in Zeeman-split superconducting systems there should exist also thermally created spin currents[29,33]. In contrast to thermoelectric currents, these spin currents do not require a spin polarization of the barrier between the materials of the hybrid and, therefore, can exist even in superconductor/normal metal hybrids provided that there is a spin-dependent particle-hole asymmetry on at least one side of the interface. It is worth to note that this spin Seebek effect (it can be also called by "thermospin" effect) is also known for normal (nonsuperconducting) systems[35,36], but the great advantage of using superconductors is that the spin-dependent particle-hole asymmetry here is very large due to the presence of the superconducting gap at the Fermi level. Due to this reason the thermally induced electric and spin currents in superconducting structures are "giant" with respect to their analogues in normal systems. The thermally induced pure spin currents were predicted at S/N interfaces with Zeeman-split superconductors[29], at interfaces between two Zeeman-split superconductors[33] and also in more complicated systems, composed of two Josephson junction interlayers[33] and Josephson junctions with spin-textured materials[34], where the additional superconducting phase control of the spin current can be achieved.

In this work we show that the existence of such a "thermospin" effect is a natural source of a thermally activated pure spin imbalance in superconductors. We explore the maximal value of this imbalance and its influence on the superconductivity of S/N bilayer. We predict that in S/N heterostructures with a temperature difference between N and S parts the spin imbalance can result in the enhancement of its critical temperature. More interesting case is when it leads to the enhancement or even appearance of superconductivity upon heating the sample. This effect can be a clear signature of the presence of the thermally induced spin imbalance in the superconductor.

There are other ways to create spin imbalance in hybrid structures. One of them is the injection of an electric current from a strong ferromagnet[37]. It is inevitably accompanied by electric currents or voltages, that is, it leads to coupling charge, spin and heat degrees of freedom simultaneously. Another way is the photo-assisted spin-imbalance[24]. But in this case the spin imbalance generation mechanism is strongly different. There is no an external source of spins in the system. The spin imbalance is acquired here not due to spatial movement of the spin but due to internal redistribution of the quasiparticles between the Zeeman-split energy subbands. This spin imbalance is absent in the absence of the spin-flip processes.

At first we describe qualitatively the mechanism of thermally induced pure spin current generated at the interface between the normal metal and the Zeeman-split superconductor. Let us consider the corresponding interface, as depicted in the insert to Fig. 1(b). The external magnetic field is applied parallel to the superconducting film in order to avoid large orbital deparing of su-

perconductivity. In this situation the main effect of the field on the superconductivity is the Zeeman splitting of the spin subbands. The gapped superconducting DOS is spin-split and the DOS for spin-up and spin-down spin subbands are shifted by the value of the Zeeman field $h = \mu_B H$ in the opposite directions from the the Fermi level, as it is shown in panels (b) and (c) of Fig. 1. At finite temperature the spin-up DOS above the gap is partially occupied by quasiparticles and the spin-down DOS is partially empty below the gap. If the superconductor temperature T_S differs from the normal metal temperature T_N, it leads to the appearance of the quasiparticle currents between each of the subbands and the normal metal. This spin-up and spin-down quasiparticle currents flow in the opposite directions and the electric currents, carried by these flows cancel each other exactly due to the overall particle-hole symmetry of the superconducting DOS. Therefore, there is no thermoelectric effect in this situation[38], but there is thermally induced pure spin current. It can be calculated as follows[29]:

$$I_s = \frac{G}{2e}\int\limits_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varepsilon (N_\uparrow - N_\downarrow)(f_N - f_S), \qquad (1)$$

where G is the conductance of the S/N interface, $N_{\uparrow,\downarrow}$ is the normalized LDOS for the corresponding spin subband in the superconductor and $f_{N,S}$ are the quasiparticle distribution functions for the normal metal and the superconductor, respectively. $f_{N,S}$ are assumed to be of the Fermi distribution form, corresponding to different temperatures $T_{N,S}$. The superconducting spin-resolved DOS takes the form $N_{\uparrow,\downarrow} = |\varepsilon \pm h|/\sqrt{(\varepsilon \pm h)^2 - \Delta^2}$ if one neglects the depairing effect of the magnetic field and other deparing factors, such as magnetic and spin-orbital impurities, for simplicity. It is seen that the spin-dependent particle-hole asymmetry is very large here for the energies of the order of Δ as compared to the nonsuperconducting case[35].

Spin imbalance. If the thermally injected spin is not removed from the superconductor or the normal metal, and the thickness of this layer is less than the spin relaxation length, the spin imbalance is accumulated in it due to the thermospin effect. The particular value of the spin imbalance depends on the parameters of the system. Further we calculate this thermally induced spin imbalance under the assumption $\tau_\varepsilon \ll \tau_G \ll \tau_{sf}$, where τ_ε is the characteristic energy relaxation time in the layer, τ_G is the characteristic time, which a quasiparticle spends in it and τ_{sf} is the spin relaxation time. Under these conditions quasiparticles in the layer can be described by a definite temperature (due to the fact that the energy relaxation is the fastest process) and the different spin species have their own chemical potentials due to the weakness of the spin-flip processes. In this case the thermally induced spin flow across the interface is compensated by the counterflow due to the different chemical potentials for spin-up and spin-down quasiparticles and the spin relaxation in the layer can be disregarded. Therefore, the



FIG. 1. (a) Spin imbalance, accumulated in the normal metal as a function of T_N. Different curves correspond to different temperatures of the superconducting reservoir T_S. Insert: sketch of the corresponding S/N system. (b) and (c) Schematic illustration of the thermospin effect for the case when the reservoir is normal. The DOS in the N layer (left) and in the S layer (right) are shown as functions of ε (vertical axis). The filled parts are occupied by electrons. The pink lines are the distribution function in S. The arrows correspond to the directions of the electron flow between the spin-up subband and the N layer.

distribution function takes the form $f_{\uparrow(\downarrow)} = f(\varepsilon \mp \mu, T)$, where μ is the resulting spin imbalance. It automatically leads to zero charge and spin flows across the interface, but the heat flow is nonzero due to the finite temperature difference at the interface. Consequently, we should also take into account the heat balance equation, which describes the removal of this heat into the phonon subsystem. The corresponding equation determines the effective temperature of the electron gas in the layer (see Appendix B for the detailed discussion) but for strong enough energy relaxation this temperature is very close to the phonon temperature in the layer $T^e \approx T^{ph} = T$.

In order to accumulate the spin imbalance in one of the layers (normal or superconducting) we should assume that its size is restricted in order to obey the inequality $\tau_G \ll \tau_{sf}$, and the other layer should be bulk and serve as a spin reservoir. Let us first analyze the case of spin accumulation in the normal layer because of its simplicity. Under our assumptions μ_N can be found from the condition of zero total spin current through the interface:

$$\int\limits_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varepsilon \sum_\sigma \sigma N_\sigma \left[\tanh\frac{\varepsilon - \sigma\mu_N}{2T_N} - \tanh\frac{\varepsilon}{2T_S}\right] = 0, \quad (2)$$

where $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$ in the subscripts and $\pm$ in the expressions.

The spin imbalance μ_N, accumulated due to the thermospin effect in the normal layer, is plotted in Fig. 1(a) as a function of T_N for different temperatures of the superconductor T_S. There are three important features in the behavior of the spin imbalance: (i) it is obvious that $\mu_N = 0$ at $T_N = T_S$ - there is no thermospin effect at all; (ii) $\mu_N \to \Delta - h$ at $T_N \ll T_S$ and (iii) $\mu_N \to -h$ for the opposite limit $T_S \ll T_N$. These characteristic features determine the maximal value of the thermally induced spin imbalance in Zeeman-split S/N heterostructures.

The opposite case of spin accumulation in the superconductor μ_S is presented in Figs. 2(b) and 3(b). This case is more complicated because of the fact that the superconducting order parameter Δ is very sensitive to the value of the spin imbalance and the particular temperature of the superconductor. At each point of the curves μ_S and Δ are determined self-consistently from Eq. (2) with the substitutions $(\varepsilon \mp \mu_N)/T_N \to \varepsilon/T_N$ and $\varepsilon/T_S \to (\varepsilon \mp \mu_S)/T_S$ and the self-consistency equation for the order parameter Δ [Eq. (3)]. Here the limiting values of the spin imbalance are the same: $\mu_S \to \Delta - h$ at $T_S \ll T_N$ and $\mu_S \to -h$ for the opposite limit $T_N \ll T_S$, but now Δ is calculated for the given h, T_S, T_N and μ_S. It is also obvious that $\mu_S \to 0$ at $\Delta \to 0$ independent of T_N and T_S.

Physically it is clear why the thermally induced spin imbalance has just these limiting values. If one neglects the spin relaxation, μ is determined by Eq. (2), which in fact means that the spin flow is zero for each of the spin subbands separately. If $T_S \ll T_N$, in the spin-up subband quasiparticles are accumulated at $\varepsilon > \Delta - h$ [see Fig. 1(c)]. Under the condition of fast thermalization processes the presence of large number of quasiparticles at $\varepsilon \sim \Delta - h$ and low temperature of the superconductor just mean that the chemical potential $\mu_\uparrow \sim \Delta - h$ for this spin subband. For the opposite case $T_N \ll T_S$ [see Fig. 1(b)] the spin balance for the spin-up subband requires that the spin flow from S to N at $\varepsilon > \Delta - h$ equals to the opposite spin flow from N to S at $\varepsilon < -\Delta - h$. It is possible if the number of quasiparticles at $\varepsilon > \Delta - h$ and $\varepsilon < -\Delta - h$ are equal, that is $\mu_\uparrow = -h$.

Superconducting order parameter. Let us now consider how the thermally induced pure spin imbalance μ_S, accumulated in the superconductor, influences the superconductivity in S/N heterostructure similar to the one sketched in Fig. 2. We assume that the superconductor is in dirty limit. The calculations are performed in the framework of the Usadel equations for the quasiclassical Green's functions[1–3,39], see Appendix A for details. The superconducting order parameter Δ depends on the anomalous Green's function F_σ and chemical potential μ_S and is calculated from the self-consistency equation:

$$\Delta = \frac{\lambda}{4} \sum_\sigma \int_{-\Omega_D}^{\Omega_D} d\varepsilon \left(\mathrm{Re}\,[F_\sigma] \tanh\left[\frac{\varepsilon - \sigma\mu_S}{2T_S} \right] \right), \quad (3)$$

where λ is the dimensionless coupling constant.



FIG. 2. (a) Superconducting order parameter for $T_N = 0.1\Delta_0$ as a function of T_S. Here $\Delta_0 \equiv \Delta(T_S = T_N = 0, h = 0)$. Different colors correspond to different magnetic fields. The dashed lines are results of the order parameter calculation at $\mu_S = 0$ (the dashed-dotted parts of the curves represent the absolutely unstable branches of the solutions). The solid lines are the results taking into account the real value of the spin imbalance. The dotted parts of these curves correspond to absolutely unstable branches of the solution. (b) The appropriate spin imbalance μ_S as a function of T_S.

We begin by considering the case of small T_N, plotted in Fig. 2. In order to clearly see the main physical effects of μ_S on superconductivity, here we neglect the depairing due to the orbital effect of the magnetic field. The resulting order parameter as a function of the superconductor temperature T_S is represented in Fig. 2(a) for different magnetic fields. The order parameter without taking into account the thermospin accumulation is plotted by dashed lines. The Zeeman depairing of superconductivity is clearly seen from these dashed curves. Solid lines represent the order parameter in the presence of the thermospin accumulation. Physically its main effect is the compensation of the Zeeman depairing[43]. As a result Δ survives at larger temperatures as compared to dashed lines.

This is the recovering of superconductivity by the creation of spin imbalance. The critical temperature increases and can sufficiently exceed its value without thermospin effect and $\Delta(T_S) \to \Delta(T_S)|_{H=0}$. The dotted parts of the curves represent absolutely unstable solutions. In the regions of existing of these unstable solutions normal ($\Delta = 0$) and superconducting states are stable simultaneously[40–42]. Therefore, the first-order transition from the superconducting to normal state should take place at high enough magnetic fields. However, the

problem of finding the exact value of the transition field is beyond the scope of the present work because we assume the spin-slip time to be the largest time scale. Nevertheless, the most part of the curves, represented in Fig. 2(a) is below the zero-temperature Pauli limiting field $h = \Delta_0/\sqrt{2}$[41].

Taking into account the realistic values of the orbital deparing due to magnetic field, we obtain qualitatively the same result, but it is less pronounced due to the presence of another depairing factor in the system. Thermally induced spin imbalance only compensates the Zeeman deparing, but does not interact with the orbital deparing.

It is interesting to note here that the the spin imbalance, which recovers superconductivity, can be induced not only by the thermal difference, but also by the spin injection from ferromagnets[43,44].



FIG. 3. (a) Superconducting order parameter for $T_N = 0.4\Delta_0$ as a function of T_S. The different types of lines mean the same as in Fig. 2. Different colors correspond to different magnetic fields. (b) μ_S as a function of T_S. The orbital deparing parameter $De^2\Delta_0 d^2/(6c^2\hbar\mu_B^2) = 0.2$.

Further we turn to considering the case of large T_N, plotted in Fig. 3. Here the realistic orbital deparing is taken into account from the very beginning. By comparing Figs. 3(a) and (b) it is seen that in this case the suppression of superconductivity by the effective Zeeman field is only increased by the spin imbalance. The suppression is strongest for the lowest superconducting temperatures, where the value of the spin imbalance is maximal. In this case superconducting order parameter shows very unusual behavior on the superconductor temperature T_S. It is absent for small T_S and arises upon heating the superconductor. The reason is that the spin accumulation becomes weaker when T_S increases and approaches T_N. It is worth noting that the effect is only possible for large enough magnetic fields ($h > 0.5\Delta_0$), when in the absence of the thermospin effect the solution of the self-consistency equation becomes multi-valued. The effect of appearing (or at least enhancement) of the order parameter upon heating the superconductor can be viewed as a hallmark of spin imbalance in it. If the contact with a hot normal reservoir only leads to the heating of the superconductor, the effect is not possible because the electron gas in the superconductor cannot have the temperature higher than T_N.

Now we discuss the applicability of our predictions to real experimental systems. Our calculations are performed under the assumption $\tau_\varepsilon \ll \tau_G \ll \tau_{sf}$ because it is the most simple and clear case from the theoretical point of view. More important thing is that the spin-flip processes are destructive for this type of spin imbalance. At the same time in real experimental setups different regimes are possible. While for thick enough Al film very weak spin-flip rates (the spin relaxation length up to the hundreds of microns, that is the condition $\tau_\varepsilon \ll \tau_{sf}$ works very well) were reported[37], the opposite case $\tau_{sf} < \tau_\varepsilon$ is realized in thin Al films (the thickness is ~ 10nm)[15–17,19,25,45]. τ_G is controlled by the S/N interface transparency and can be varied in wide range. Therefore, from the experimental data one can conclude that it is more preferable to use thick enough films. The film thickness is, in fact, restricted by two conditions. (i) It should be small compared to the spin relaxation length. (ii) The film should be not too thick, such that the Zeeman is still the essential deparing factor. Quantitatively, the relative influence of the orbital depairing with respect to the Zeeman one is controlled by the parameter $\alpha/h = De^2Hd^2/(6\mu_B\hbar c^2)$[46], which should not be considerably larger than unity. For the typical Al parameters and $h \sim \Delta_0$ it means that $d \lesssim$.

In conclusion, we have shown that the giant "thermospin" effect in Zeeman-split S/N heterostructures can lead to an accumulation of a pure spin imbalance in some parts of a system. The maximal value of this imbalance is of the order of Zeeman splitting of the superconducting DOS. This thermally induced pure spin accumulation strongly influences the superconductivity in the heterostructure. Different regimes are possible: if the superconducting part is more hot than the normal one, the spin imbalance weakens the Zeeman depairing and, therefore, recovers superconductivity in the system. Otherwise, if the normal part is more hot, than the imbalance strengthens the Zeeman depairing of superconductivity. It can result in the appearance of superconductivity upon heating the sample. It is obvious that the spin imbalance also strongly influences the weak superconductivity regions, such as Josephson junction interlayers. Therefore, the discussed here effect can be used to control the appearence and positions of $0-\pi$ transitions in the S/N/S junctions via the manipulating the temperature difference between the leads and the interlayer.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to M. Silaev and T. Heikkilä for the fruitful discussions.

Appendix A: Usadel Green's functions in terms of the θ-parametrization

For the problem under consideration it is enough to find the retarded and advanced Green's functions in the approximation of the impenetrable S/N interface. In terms of the so-called θ-parametrization[47] the Usadel equation for the retarded Green's function in the superconducting film takes the form:

$$(\varepsilon \pm h)\sinh\theta_{\uparrow,\downarrow} + \Delta\cosh\theta_{\uparrow,\downarrow} + iD\frac{e^2}{6c^2\hbar}H^2d^2\cosh\theta_{\uparrow,\downarrow}\sinh\theta_{\uparrow,\downarrow} = 0, \quad \text{(A1)}$$

The last term in Eq. (A1) accounts for the depairing of superconductivity in thin films by the orbital effect of the magnetic field[46]. The normalized DOS can be found as

$$N_{\uparrow,\downarrow} = \mathrm{Re}\left[\cosh\theta_{\uparrow,\downarrow}\right], \quad \text{(A2)}$$

and the anomalous Green's function, which enters the self-consistency equation, takes the form

$$F_{\uparrow,\downarrow} = \sinh\theta_{\uparrow,\downarrow}. \quad \text{(A3)}$$

Appendix B: heat balance equation

If we neglect the elastic spin-flip processes completely, that is assume $\tau_{sf}\to\infty$, from the Keldysh part of the Usadel equation we obtain the following equation for the distribution function φ_σ[23]:

$$D\kappa_\sigma\partial_x^2\varphi_\sigma - I_{\sigma,e-ph} - I_{\sigma,e-e} = 0\ , \quad \text{(B1)}$$

where $\kappa_\sigma = 1 + |\cosh\theta_\sigma|^2 - |\sinh\theta_\sigma|^2$ accounts for the renormalization of the diffusion constant by superconductivity. The collision integrals $I_{\sigma,e-ph}$ and $I_{\sigma,e-ph}$ describe the electron-phonon and electron-electron relaxation processes, respectively. Please note that in the problem under consideration we only consider the so-called "symmetric" types of the quasiparticle nonequilibrium, when the electron and hole components of the distribution function are the same, the distribution function has no τ_3 contribution. This is because the source of the nonequilibrium here is the temperature gradient, which is just of this symmetric type.

We assume that the film thickness in the x direction is smaller than the characteristic relaxation length of the distribution function. Then $\varphi_{\uparrow,\downarrow}$ does not depend on x. Integrating Eq. (B1) over the width d of the film along the x-direction and taking into account the boundary conditions for the distribution function[23]

$$\kappa_\sigma\partial_x\varphi_\sigma\Big|_{x=0} = \frac{2G}{\sigma_S}Re[\cosh\theta_\sigma]\left(\varphi_\sigma - \tanh\frac{\varepsilon}{2T_N}\right)\ , \quad \text{(B2)}$$

where σ_S is the normal state conductivity of the superconductor, one can obtain that φ_σ obeys the following equation:

$$-\frac{2Re[\cosh\theta_\sigma]}{\tau_G}\left(\varphi_\sigma - \tanh\frac{\varepsilon}{2T_N}\right) = I_{\sigma,e-ph} + I_{\sigma,e-e}\ , \quad \text{(B3)}$$

where we introduce the characteristic time, which a quasiparticle spends in the superconducting layer $\tau_G = (\sigma_S d)/(GD)$.

Multiplying the kinetic equation Eq. (B3) by the quasiparticle energy ε and integrating it over energy, one can obtain the heat balance equation, which takes the form:

$$-\frac{2}{\tau_G}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\varepsilon d\varepsilon Re[\cosh\theta_\sigma]\left(\varphi_\sigma - \tanh\frac{\varepsilon}{2T_N}\right) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\varepsilon d\varepsilon I_{\sigma,e-ph}\ , \quad \text{(B4)}$$

the contribution of the electron-electron relaxation term equals zero because this term conserves the total energy. Eq. (B4) determines the effective temperature $T^e_{S,\sigma}$ of the electron subsystem of the superconductor for a spin σ. However, due to the overall particle-hole symmetry $Re[\cosh\theta_\sigma(\varepsilon)] = Re[\cosh\theta_{-\sigma}(-\varepsilon)]$, $Re[\sinh\theta_\sigma(\varepsilon)] = Re[\sinh\theta_{-\sigma}(-\varepsilon)]$ and $\varphi_\sigma(-\varepsilon) = -\varphi_{-\sigma}(-\varepsilon)$ (the last equality is only valid for the symmetric type of nonequilibrium) the electron-phonon integral[23,24,48]

$$I_{\sigma,e-ph} = 8g_{ph}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}d\varepsilon'(\varepsilon'-\varepsilon)^2\mathrm{sgn}(\varepsilon'-\varepsilon)\times \Big[Re[\cosh\theta_\sigma(\varepsilon)]Re[\cosh\theta_\sigma(\varepsilon')] - Re[\sinh\theta_\sigma(\varepsilon)]Re[\sinh\theta_\sigma(\varepsilon')]\Big]\times \left\{\coth\frac{\varepsilon'-\varepsilon}{2T_S}[\varphi_\sigma(\varepsilon)-\varphi_\sigma(\varepsilon')] - \varphi_\sigma(\varepsilon)\varphi_\sigma(\varepsilon') + 1\right\} \quad \text{(B5)}$$

also manifests the same symmetry $I_{\sigma,e-ph}(-\varepsilon) = -I_{-\sigma,e-ph}(\varepsilon)$. In this case Eq. (B4) is valid at the same temperature $T^e_{S,\uparrow} = T^e_{S,\downarrow} = T^e_S$ for the both spin directions. In addition, if the electron-phonon relaxation is strong, that is $\tau_{e-ph} \ll \tau_G$, the electron temperature T^e_S is very close to the phonon temperature T_S. It is this case that is considered in the main text of our paper. If the electron-phonon interaction is not so strong, that is $\tau_{e-ph} \lesssim \tau_G$, all our results for the order parameter are still valid, but T^e_S (which is higher than T_S) should be substituted for T_S in all the plots in Figs. 1-3 of the main text. The opposite limit $\tau_{e-ph} \gg \tau_G$ is not of interest, because in this case the electron temperature in the superconductor is very close to the temperature of the normal reservoir T_N and the thermally induced spin imbalance is negligible.

[1] M. Eschrig, Reports on Progress in Physics **78** 104501 (2015).
[2] A. I. Buzdin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 935 (2005).
[3] F.S. Bergeret, A.F. Volkov, and K.B. Efetov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 1321 (2005).
[4] R.S. Keizer, S.T.B. Goennenwein, T.M. Klapwijk, G. Miao, G. Xiao, and A. Gupta, Nature (London) **439**, 825 (2006).
[5] M. Alidoust, J. Linder, G. Rashedi, T. Yokoyama, and A. Sudbo, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 014512 (2010).
[6] J.W.A. Robinson, J.D.S. Witt, and M.G. Blamire, Science **329**, 59 (2010).
[7] T.S. Khaire, M.A. Khasawneh, W.P Pratt, and N.O. Birge, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 137002 (2010).
[8] M.S. Anwar, F. Czeschka, M. Hesselberth, M. Porcu, and J. Aarts, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 100501(R) (2010).
[9] F. S. Bergeret, I. V. Tokatly, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 134517 (2014).
[10] I. Gomperud, J. Linder, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 035416 (2015).
[11] S.H. Jacobsen, J.A. Ouassou, J. Linder, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 024510 (2015).
[12] S.H. Jacobsen, J.Linder, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 024501 (2015).
[13] M. Alidoust and K. Halterman, J. Phys: Cond. Matt. 27, 235301 (2015).
[14] H. Yang, S.-H. Yang, S. Takahashi, S. Maekawa, and S.S.P. Parkin, Nature Mater. **9**, 586 (2010).
[15] F. Hubler, M.J. Wolf, D. Beckmann, and H.v. Lohneysen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 207001 (2012).
[16] C.H.L. Quay, D. Chevallier, C. Bena, M. Aprili, Nature Phys. **9**, 84 (2013).
[17] M.J. Wolf, F. Hubler, S. Kolenda, H.v. Lohneysen, and D. Beckmann, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 024517 (2013).
[18] T. Wakamura, N. Hasegawa, K. Ohnishi, Y. Niimi, and YoshiChika Otani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 036602 (2014).
[19] M. J. Wolf, C. Surgers, G. Fischer, and D. Beckmann, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 144509 (2014).
[20] I.V. Bobkova and A.M. Bobkov, JETP Letters, **101**, 118 (2015).
[21] M. Silaev, P. Virtanen, F.S. Bergeret, T.T. Heikkila, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 167002 (2015).
[22] T. Krishtop, M. Houzet, J. S. Meyer, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 121407(R) (2015).
[23] I.V. Bobkova and A.M. Bobkov, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 024513 (2016).
[24] P. Virtanen, T.T. Heikkila, and F.S. Bergeret, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 014512 (2016).
[25] C.H.L. Quay, C. Dutreix, D. Chevallier, C. Bena, M. Aprili, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 220501 (2016).
[26] F. Giazotto and F. Taddei, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 132501 (2008).
[27] J. Linder, J. W. A. Robinson, Nature Phys. **11**, 307 (2015).
[28] P. Machon, M. Eschrig, W. Belzig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 047002 (2013).
[29] A. Ozaeta, P. Virtanen, F.S. Bergeret, and T.T. Heikkila, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 057001 (2014).
[30] M.S. Kalenkov, A.D. Zaikin, L.S. Kuzmin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 147004 (2012).
[31] S. Kolenda, M.J. Wolf, D. Beckmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 097001 (2016).
[32] S. Kolenda, P. Machon, D. Beckmann, and W. Belzig, arXiv:1604.01940.
[33] J. Linder, M.E. Bathen, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 224509 (2016).
[34] M.E. Bathen, J. Linder, arXiv:1608.06285
[35] G. Bauer, E. Saitoh, and B.J. van Wees, Nat. Mat. (2012)
[36] A. Slachter, F. Bakker, J. Adam, and B.J. van Wees, Nature Phys. (2010)
[37] M. Johnson and R.H. Silsbee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 1790 (1985).
[38] The thermally induced electric currents (giant thermoelectric effect) at zero voltage bias are only possible if the spin-up and spin-dow conductivities of the interface are different, for example at a superconductor/ferromagnet interface[28,29]. However, the giant thermoelectric effect was also reported at a S/N interface at nonzero applied voltage in the nonlinear regime[32].
[39] A.A. Golubov, M.Yu. Kupriyanov, and E. Ilichev, Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 411 (2004).
[40] G. Sarma, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **24**, 1029 (1963).
[41] A.I. Larkin and Yu.N. Ovchinnikov, Sov. Phys. JETP **20**, 762 (1965) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **47**, 1136 (1964)].
[42] I.V. Bobkova and A.M. Bobkov, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 224501 (2014).
[43] I.V. Bobkova and A.M. Bobkov, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 140508 (2011).
[44] I.V. Bobkova and A.M. Bobkov, JETP Lett. **101**, 407 (2015).
[45] N. Poli, J.P. Morten, M. Urech, A. Brataas, D.B. Haviland, and V. Korenivski, Phys.Rev. Lett. **100**, 136601 (2008).
[46] K. Maki, Gapless superconductivity. In: Parks R.D. (ed.) Superconductivity, Ch.18, p. 1035, Marcel Decker (1969).
[47] W. Belzig, F.K. Wilhelm, C. Bruder, G. Schon, A.D.Zaikin, Superlattices and Microstructures, **25**, 1251 (1999).
[48] N.B. Kopnin *Theory of Nonequilibrium Superconductivity*, Oxford University Press, 2001.